G. R. S. 58]

Previous references.

1892-3
~~191~~

File No. 405

Serial Nos.

(Inward)

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Part B for

SUBJECT. Passing orders on the Appeal Petition of Sirigia Satani Pujari of the Anjaneyaswami Temple at Kengeri, Bangalore Taluk regarding the presentation of Prasadam in plates.

Petition No. 2345 of 24th February 1890 from Sanjeeva Archuck of Anjanaya Swami Temple, Kanjeri Kuchah, Bangalore Taluk.

Docket No. 226 of 27 June 1890 from the Dy: Comm^r Bangalore District, Submitting the Proceedings in the case.

---

16 July/88

One Ramaiah complained to the Taluk Amildar that the Poojaries of the Anjanaya Temple Sanjeeh

Sanjeeb, Puttah and
Narsiah were in
-structor in per-
-forming the Poojah,
that is the Karteekoo
tawa of this year, the
Archucks - Sanjeeb
and Putta in dis-
-tributing the Prasa
-da (Flowers & Fruits)
& counted the Brahmins
to receive it from
their hands instead
of putting the Prasada
in a dish and placing
it before the Brahmins.

that

that the Brahmins took
objections and went
away; that orders
may be issued to
the Curchucks to dis
-tribute to Brahmins,
the Prasada ac-
-cording to Mamool
and that if this
cannot be done
another Curchuck
may be nominated.
The Shanbogue to
whom this complaint
was referred sub-
-mitted the depositions

25 May/55

4

Ramjiah – Ramjiah states that the Poojahs are regularly performed; that it was not the Ramanad to put the Prasada in a dish and place it before the Brahmins for distribution; that he had no objection to do so, but his co-sharers would take objection to the novel procedure; that Narayanah (the

complainant

5

complainant / is a

mischievious person;

and he had only

himself signed the

Petition whereas

he had stated in

it to be one from

the inhabitants of

the Fort and Town

of Kengiri - The

Shanbogue Submitted

as directed by the

Amildar a Muhazar

signed by 13 Brahmins

and 17 Ryots which

takes that contrary

to

31 Augt/58

This Muhazar appears to be in the handwriting of Cumbarramapah and Narrapah the ~~complainant~~ complainant has not signed it -

to remove the brahmin
which wanted
the Brahmins to
receive the Prasada
from his hands; that
it was usual for the
Prasada dish being
laid before the Brah-
mins, that they
took objections to this
and all went away-
On this the Amildar
of Bangalore issued
a notice to the brahmin 26 June/69
which that if he
does not place the

Prasada

Prasada plate before
the Brahmins for
distribution by them
he would be dis-
missed - The
Archuck Singiah
in attesting the
receipt of the letter
stated that he
will have no ob-
jection to act
according to Mamool
of distributing the
Prasada by his own
hand - The Amildar
reported

reported to the Dy: Comr. that on a complaint and a Mahazar from the inhabitants of Kempery that Lechuk Singh was distributing the Prasada sent by his own hands contrary to usage the Lechuck was directed to stop doing so and to place the Prasada with before the Brahmins

6 Augt/89

GOVERNMENT

Brahmins; that the
Mehtuck refused to
do so and has ~~ited~~
orders to suspend
him and to nominate
another man to
perform the Poojah.
The Dy: Comm^r in reply
sent another notice
under his signature
and ordered the Chief
-dar to have it
served on the Mehtuck
and returned. The
Notice runs thus.

The Mehtuck Satani
Singrich is hereby
informed

informed that though
he was directed by
the Tahsildar
to place, according
to manual, the
Prasada dish before
the Brahmins he has
refused to do so;
that the Tahsildar
having recommended
him to be suspended
from the archuck
duty, it is necessary
that an enquiry
should be held on
the 28 Augt/69 - He
is therefore directed

to appear before this
Court at 12 A. M. on
the above date.

Sanjivia as directed
appeared and gave
the deposition stating
that he was hitherto
as usual giving the
Prasada from his
own hands but that
hereafter as now
directed by the
Sirkar he will
place the Prasada
in a dish and lay
it before the Brahmin
and for other caste
people

people he will give
from his own hands.
A copy of this was
forwarded to the 11 Sept/89
Bangalore Cantonment
with directions to
watch the mechanics
actions.

-Sd/- Jujiah Dom.

Married to the Govt. 20 Sept/89.
Assist. Commr. as
follows.

Your honor stated
on the day the enquiry
was held by you
regarding the dis.
tribution of Prasada
that

that I have any other
witnesses as Shareer
who should also be
examined; that the
complainant was
not present; that
when I asked that
the case should be
tried and you direct
that this is not a
Magisterial case and
that I should do as
directed by Sirkar;
that in the order
sent to the Amildar
it is stated that
I have consented
in

in my deposition
taken before you,
to do as directed;
that the Unildar
should see and
watch over my
action; that I am
not willing to do
as directed in the
said order in regard
to the distribution of
Prasada; that by
turns I do the Poojah
work 3 months once
in 2 years; that to
get rid of this dis-
- puted Anjaneya
Temple

Temple; that if this
unusual a - were
to be enfo) this
application may be
accepted as Razee-
- mamah and beg
to state that my
cosharers' and others
were not examined
and that no regular
enquiry in the case
was held from the
beginning -

10 Sept/89. Ramsaik another
brchmk of the Temple
complained to the Dy:
Comm: that besides
him

him there are 6 other
Muckdar Mehnicks
for the Anjanaya Tem-
ple; that on the com-
plaint of Chenibagen
Naraapah who was
the only one that
signed the Petition
though it is stated
as one from the Inha-
bitants of Kengery
Kushah, the Bengalore
Amildar sent for the
1/4th Hissadar Singiah
and served him
with a notice that
if he does not
distribute

distribute the Prasada
to the Brahmins in a
choki he would be
dismissed; that on
the notice Sinjeah
appears to have made
a khara that he
would do according
to Mamool; that the
Amildar reported the
matter to the District
who sent for him and
issued orders to him
to do as directed by
the Sirkar; that the
Amildar is pressing

us

as to do as Singiah was directed to do; that the Shanbogue Narrapah being related to the Amildar their case was not fully enquired into; that orders might be issued to distribute the Pravada according to Immemorial; that if an enquiry was to be held it should be done in the District Court and not before the Amildar.

These

VC

23 Sept/09

These 2 complaints were forwarded to the Auditor for report- ~~other reported that that case was pending~~ ~~settled~~ No enquiry appears to have been held ~~instituted~~ by the Auditor and there is no paper on the file to show why he had not done so, but anyhow another notice from the Au.t Commissioner was issued through the Auditor to Urbano Bonjean

to present himself
before the Asst Comr
on the 28 Oct/89 -
The Notice was
served and returned -
The Constable was
informed by the 11 Nov/89
Asst Comr that
Kachuck Sinjiahi
Complaint has
already been disposed
of; that the accom-
-panying Notice
directing the other
Complainants to
~~sig~~ them to appear
before him on the
28th

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

28 Nov/89 May file
served and returned
with the file - after
enquiry the Dy:
Commr issued an
5 Dec/89 - order to the Guidsar
stating that Narsiah
stated that it was
usual to give to the
Brahmins the Prasada
from the hands of
the Mochuks and not
to place the dish before
them; that there are
no sufficient reasons
to admit this statement;
that his order 9/11 Sept
1889 issued to him
after

after enquiry of both
which appears
reasonable and that
that order should
be intimated to the
Complainant -

On the above order
the Petitioner Singh
appeals to this Offic
on the following
grounds -

1- That he has been
conducting the duties
of the Temple in ac-
-cordance to the Manual.
that on the complaint
of some mischievous
persons he has been
directed

directed to distribute the Prasada to Brahmans in a dish which had never been the custom; that no enquiry was held whether such distribution was a Mamool or not -

2. That the Asst. Comm. who held an enquiry refused to examine his witnesses as regards the Mamool though he had requested him to do so.

3. That the Asst. Comm. passed an order that the Petitioner had agreed before.

before him to give the Prasada in a dish to the Brahmins and that the Amildar should see it enforced. that the Pet. replied sented to the Amildar denying the above fact and asked him to hold an enquiry which was not done 4- That what the complainants (Karnatak Brahmins) and the Taluk authorities wanted the Pet. to do is against Shastra. and that an order may be issued to hold an enquiry into the matter.

A. K. Ramanujam
9 Augt 1890.

25

M No 2345 dated
4th July 1890

Petitioner
Rengiah
Archak of
Anjaneyaswami temple
Kanigiri
Nangalam Taluq

This is an appeal
against the order of
the DJ Court dated
4th Sept 1889 directing
the Pltff to present to
the Brahmans on each
Utsab instead of giving
it as by the hand.

Petitioner contends
that it is not usual
to present the Prasadam
on a plate, but that

the Dr Const. order
was contrary to
Dharma.

Petitioner is of the
Satani caste, & it
is therefore that Brahmans
object to receive Prasadam
by her hands. —

The following
Endorsement will be
issued. —

"The Govt declare
to interfere with the
order of the Dr Const. R
which appears to be
proper" —

16/7/90

18/7/90

contrary to Manual.

Petitioner is of the
Appl Satani caste and is
is therefore on that Brah
Appl objects to receive Prasad
Sur from his hand-
are
Adjo The Government declin
to interfere with the
order of the Dy Coll
which appeared to the people

contrary to Hindu law. 28

Petitioner is of the Satani caste and it is on that ~~therefore~~ that Brahmins object to receive Prasadam ~~from~~ his hand.

The Government declined Decision to interfere with the order of the Dy Court ~~which it appeared proper~~.

1871

Before the Government of His *Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore

---

Appeal No. 2345 of 4th February 1890

Appellant. Vs. Respondent

Singiah, archak of
Anjanayaswamy temple,
Kengeri,
Bangalore Taluq

Decision. 18.8.90

This is an appeal against the orders of the Deputy Commissioner dated 4th September 1889, directing the petitioner to present the Prasadam (flowers &c) to Brahmins in a plate instead of giving it by the hand—

Petitioner complains that it is not usual to present the Prasadam in a plate and that the Deputy Commissioners' order was contrary to manual.

Petitioner is of the Satani caste and it is therefore that Brahmins object to receive Prasadam by his hand:—

The following endorsement will be issued:—

"The Government decline to interfere with the orders of the Deputy Commissioner which appears to be proper".

By order.

21/9/90

Under Secretary

No 6407 / 286 dt 3-Sept/90
9 & VP.

Copy forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District, with the Proceedings received with his no 226 dated 27th June 1890.

By order

Under Secretary.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 2345
dated 4th Feb: 1890 received at the
Dewan's Office from Singayya, Priest
of Anjaneyaswami Temple,
Kengeri Kasbah in the Banga-
lore Taluk, — — —

is forwarded, together with its one
enclosures, to the Dy: Commr,
Bangalore DO for submission of Proceedings:

Drafted as per
Co's order. PD

By Order,

BANGALORE,
26/5/1890.

For Chief Secretary

28th

AR

Case No
Pros
Ref
26/1790

His Honor the Dewan to His Highness
the Maharajah of Mysore

The Humble Petition of [illegible]

[illegible]

5 That thereupon, I received a notice from the Court of the General [illegible] Commissioner of Bangalore District to [illegible] for enquiry on the 29th [illegible] 1890 as the Amildar had [illegible] [illegible]

6 That the Assistant Commissioner refused to examine witnesses as to [illegible] though requested and passed an order that I agreed to give [illegible] to [illegible] in a [illegible] and that the Amildar should see that the thing is done accordingly

7 That after taking a copy of [illegible] order, I presented a petition to the [illegible] Commissioner [illegible] that I did not agree to do so [illegible] to be compelled to do [illegible] I [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

8 That [illegible] [illegible] the 1890 [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] beg to state that [illegible] [illegible]

9 For these and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] respectfully pray that [illegible] will be pleased to [illegible] [illegible] held into [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] both sides. A Certified Copy of [illegible] Court order is [illegible]

Bangalore

4th Feb 1890

(General Serial No. 29.)

188

3-JUL.90
22
EW N OF MY. ORE

From

2/4

To

The Chief Secretary to the ~~Durbar~~ Govt. of Mysore.

Petition dated 27th June 1890 as per 3/7/90

Dated 27th June 1890.
Despatched
Received

Enclosures No. 1 file

General No. 226
No.

A. Komarasami Mudaliyar for precis early. 5th July/90.

Comm. Cell 9 Aug/90.

His Official Memo No. 1/23 dated 28th Ultimo.

In returning the enclosures received with the above, has the honor to forward herewith, the entire proceedings connected with the petition of Sinigaya, Priest of Anjaneya temple, Kengeri Kasba, Bangalore Taluk, as called for in the above.

H. Kumara Rao
for Deputy Commissioner

Vrs

A2 19.8.90 B1 7.8.90

2345

ICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE,

2nd Sept 1890.

Appellant. V Respondent.

Singiah archak of
Anjaneyaswamy Temple
Kengere Bangalore

Endorsement.

In reply to his Petition, dated 4th February 1890

the petitioner is informed that the
~~is informed~~ Government decline to interfere
with the order of the deputy commissioner
which appears to be proper

The Enclosure is returned

2 Sept 1890

By order

Under Secretary

5/9/90

...F MYSORE.

1 91.

Sub Council 28/8/91

...deus

Returned in reference to the annexed letter dated 15/9/91

...is Excellency the Dewan to His Highness the Maharajah of Mysore

The Humble Memorial of Archuta Bhujah, Poojaree or worshipper of Anjanayaswamy Temple at Hengeri Hobli in Bangalore Talook Sheweth

1 That from the time immemorial my ancestors and myself have been the rightful Poojarees and have been, as such, conducting and managing all the affairs connected with the said Anjanayaswamy Temple in accordance with the Usages

2 That it being so, one of the Mahratta Brahmins residing in Hengeri ... commenced litigation with me & others, at time about 5 years ago by making an anonymous Petition to the Amildar to the effect that I must be deprived of nine Pagodas in a dish from the Hobli and the Revenue Authorities having His Honor the Deputy Commissioner of Bangalore agreed with the Amildar's order directed me to comply with it after

3 That against this order I ... to the Court of Head ... Assistant Commissioner ...

the effect that the Government
[illegible] with the order of the
Commissioner which appear to be respe.

4 That I most humbly and
respectfully beg to state that giving
Prasada in a dish to any class in the
temple in question was and has been
against Agamas and the thing which
my Counter Petitioner claim contrary
to Agamas cannot be maintained.
and enforced summarily

5 That according to their own
showing, they claim a right to give
them Prasada in a dish and never
object but I most humbly beg to submit
that only cognizable by the Civil
Civil Courts.

That I am being very much
grieved and troubled by both the
Karnataka Brahmins and the anti-
Agamists in the Counter Petitioners the
extent which may, as above stated
be contrary to Agamas and in course
of long that I may be directed to
[illegible] my livelihood and [illegible]
[illegible] the courts

For these reasons the
I most humbly pray that
Honour will be pleased to
[illegible] and pass an order [illegible]

For which act of charity & Indulgence I as in duty bound ever pray &c
Your Honors long life & prosperity
Bangalore
26th December 1890

6 MAR 91

I, Petitioner Singaiah humbly beg to submit that as stamps were not available for three days I presented the Petition owing to Christmas Holidays, I was obliged to write the Petition without a Court Fee Stamp & the Court refused one Rupee stamp & the Petition and prayed that your Honor will be pleased to reconsider in case on the grounds herein set forth

Bangalore
March 1891

By Order
Assistant
Under Secretary

[illegible]

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
3 - FEB 91

[illegible]
5 - 3 - 91

No.
351
Reg

[illegible]

Two Rupees stamp affixed [illegible]

[illegible]

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
21 MAY 91

[illegible] 30 [illegible] 1891 [illegible]

[illegible]

By Order

[signature]

Under Secretary

Endorsement.

In reply to his Petition dated 5th March 1891 Petition of Archaka Singiah, Poojari or ~~worshipper~~ Anjanayaswamy Temple at Kengeri Kasba in Bangalore Taluk, is referred to the ~~is informed that~~ order already issued.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
13/9/1891.

By Order,

for Chief Secretary.

Draft as per C's dr

AR